

A RELATIVE THEORY OF UNIVERSAL CENTRAL EXTENSIONS

JOSÉ MANUEL CASAS AND TIM VAN DER LINDEN

ABSTRACT. Basing ourselves on Janelidze and Kelly's general notion of central extension, we study universal central extensions in the context of semi-abelian categories. Thus we unify classical, recent and new results in one conceptual framework. The theory we develop is relative to a chosen Birkhoff subcategory of the category considered: for instance, we consider groups vs. abelian groups, Lie algebras vs. vector spaces, precrossed modules vs. crossed modules and Leibniz algebras vs. Lie algebras.

INTRODUCTION

This article provides a unified framework for the study of universal central extensions, using techniques from categorical Galois theory with, in particular, Janelidze and Kelly's relative theory of central extensions [27]. Its aim is to make explicit the underlying unity of results in the literature (for groups, Leibniz algebras, precrossed modules, etc. [1, 10, 11, 21, 22]) and to join them in one general setting. Thus a basic theory of universal central extensions is developed for all those special cases simultaneously.

We work in a pointed Barr exact Goursat category $\mathcal{A}$ with a chosen Birkhoff subcategory $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$; the universal central extensions of $\mathcal{A}$ are defined relative to the chosen $\mathcal{B}$. This is the minimal setting in which the theory of central extensions from [27] can be used to obtain meaningful results on the relations between perfect objects and universal central extensions. (Indeed, we need $\mathcal{A}$ to be Barr exact and Goursat for the concepts of normal and central extension to coincide, and for split epimorphic central extensions to be trivial; and perfect objects can only be properly considered in a pointed context.)

This at the same time *categorical* and *Galois theoretic* approach due to Janelidze and Kelly is based on, and generalises, the work of the Fröhlich school [19, 20, 34] which focused on varieties of Ω -groups. Recall [24] that a **variety of Ω -groups** is a variety of universal algebras which has amongst its operations and identities those of the variety of groups but has just one constant; furthermore, a Birkhoff subcategory of a variety is the same thing as a subvariety.

In order to construct universal central extensions, we further narrow the context to that of semi-abelian categories with enough projectives [4, 28], which still includes all varieties of Ω -groups. We need a good notion of short exact sequence to construct the centralisation of an extension, and the existence of projective objects gives us weakly universal central extensions. The switch to semi-abelian categories also allows us to make the connection with existing homology theories [14, 17, 18].

Although some examples (e.g., groups vs. abelian groups and Lie algebras vs. vector spaces) are *absolute*, meaning that they fit into the theory relative to the subcategory of all abelian objects, others are not: precrossed modules vs. crossed

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 17A32, 18B99, 18E99, 18G50, 20J05.

Key words and phrases. Categorical Galois theory, semi-abelian category, homology, Baer invariant.

modules, and Leibniz algebras vs. Lie algebras, for instance. In this absolute case, some results were already investigated in [22]; they appear as special cases of our general theory.

The text is structured as follows. In the first section we develop that part of the theory which does not depend on the existence of either projective objects or short exact sequences. Here we work in pointed Barr exact Goursat categories. We sketch the context and recall the basic definitions of *perfect object* and (*universal*) *central extension*. Some of the simpler correspondences between them are developed: Proposition 1.9 on composing central extensions and Proposition 1.12 on the universality of a central extension vs. perfectness of its domain. Further results are obtained in the setting of semi-abelian categories with enough projectives. In Section 2 we prove that any perfect object admits a universal central extension (Theorem 2.13); we show that a central extension is universal exactly when its domain is perfect and projective with respect to all central extensions (Corollary 2.14), and we also make connections with semi-abelian homology (Corollary 2.15). In Section 3 we consider the case of nested Birkhoff subcategories $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$. Given a perfect object B of $\mathcal{B}$ we obtain a short exact sequence comparing the second homology of B , viewed as an object of $\mathcal{B}$, with the second homology of B , viewed as an object of $\mathcal{A}$. The difference between them is expressed in terms of a universal central extension of B (Proposition 3.3). Finally, in Section 4, we show how the theory unifies existing with new results by explaining the examples of groups vs. abelian groups, Leibniz algebras vs. Lie algebras vs. vector spaces, and precrossed modules vs. crossed modules vs. abelian crossed modules.

1. BASIC DEFINITIONS AND RESULTS

In their article [27], Janelidze and Kelly introduced a general theory of relative central extensions in the context of exact Goursat categories. This is the theory we shall be considering here, focusing on the induced relative notion of universal central extension. We give an overview of the needed definitions and prove some preliminary results on the relation between universal central extensions and perfect objects. In the next section we shall further narrow the context to semi-abelian categories with enough projectives in order to prove the existence of universal central extensions.

1.1. Barr exact Goursat categories. Recall that a **regular epimorphism** is a coequaliser of some pair of arrows. A category is **regular** when it is finitely complete with coequalisers of kernel pairs and with pullback-stable regular epimorphisms. In a regular category, any morphism may be factored as a regular epimorphism followed by a monomorphism, and this **image factorisation** is unique up to isomorphism. A category is **Barr exact** when it is regular and such that any internal equivalence relation is a kernel pair.

The theory of central extensions considered in [27] starts working well in exact **Goursat** categories. (Then, for instance, the concepts of normal extension and central extension coincide, and every split epimorphic central extension is trivial. Both of these facts are crucial in what follows.) These are Barr exact categories which satisfy the condition $SRS = RSR$ for all equivalence relations R, S . For most examples the slightly less general and better known context of exact **Mal'tsev** categories suffices: here any internal reflexive relation is an equivalence relation or, equivalently, the condition $SR = RS$ holds for all equivalence relations R, S . A variety is Mal'tsev in this sense if and only if it is a *Mal'tsev variety*. Moreover, a Barr exact category is Mal'tsev if and only if the pushout of a regular epimorphism along a regular epimorphism always exists, and the comparison map to the induced pullback is also a regular epimorphism [8]. See [27] for further details.

1.2. Birkhoff subcategories. The notion of central extension introduced in [27] is *relative*, being defined with respect to a chosen subcategory $\mathcal{B}$ of the category $\mathcal{A}$ considered.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Barr exact Goursat category. A **Birkhoff subcategory** $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is a full and reflective subcategory which is closed under subobjects and regular quotients. We write the induced adjunction as

$$\mathcal{A} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \\ \rightrightarrows \end{array} \mathcal{B} \quad (\mathbf{A})$$

and denote its unit $\eta: 1_{\mathcal{A}} \Rightarrow \mathbf{b}$. A Birkhoff subcategory of a variety of universal algebras is the same thing as a subvariety. If $\mathcal{A}$ is finitely complete Barr exact Goursat then so is any Birkhoff subcategory $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$.

For a given full, replete and reflective subcategory $\mathcal{B}$, being closed under subobjects is equivalent to the components η_A of the unit of the adjunction being regular epimorphisms. If now $\mathcal{B}$ is full, reflective and closed under subobjects then the Birkhoff property of $\mathcal{B}$ (i.e., closure under quotients) is equivalent to the following condition: given any regular epimorphism $f: B \rightarrow A$ in $\mathcal{A}$, the induced square of regular epimorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ \eta_B \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_A \\ \mathbf{b}B & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}f} & \mathbf{b}A \end{array} \quad (\mathbf{B})$$

is a pushout.

From now on, $\mathcal{B}$ will be a fixed Birkhoff subcategory of a chosen Barr exact Goursat category $\mathcal{A}$.

1.3. Extensions and central extensions. An **extension** in $\mathcal{A}$ is a regular epimorphism. A morphism of extensions is a commutative square between them, and thus we obtain the category $\text{Ext}\mathcal{A}$ of extensions in $\mathcal{A}$.

With respect to the Birkhoff subcategory $\mathcal{B}$, there are notions of *trivial*, *normal* and *central* extension. An extension $f: B \rightarrow A$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is **trivial (with respect to $\mathcal{B}$)** or **b-trivial** when the induced square $(\mathbf{B})$ is a pullback. The extension f is **normal (with respect to $\mathcal{B}$)** or **b-normal** when both projections f_0, f_1 in the kernel pair $(R[f], f_0, f_1)$ of f are b-trivial. That is to say, f is normal with respect to $\mathcal{B}$ if and only if in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R[f] & \xrightarrow{f_0} & B & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ & \xrightarrow{f_1} & \downarrow \eta_B & & \\ \eta_{R[f]} \downarrow & & \mathbf{b}B & & \\ \mathbf{b}R[f] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}f_0} & & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}f_1} & \mathbf{b}B \end{array}$$

either one of the left hand side squares is a pullback. Finally, f is **central (with respect to $\mathcal{B}$)** or **b-central** when there exists an extension $g: C \rightarrow A$ such that the pullback g^*f of f along g is trivial.

Remark 1.4. Clearly, every normal extension is central; in the present context, the converse also holds, and thus the concepts of normal and central extension coincide. Furthermore, a split epimorphism is a trivial extension if and only if it is a central extension [27, Theorem 4.8]. Finally, central extensions are pullback-stable [27, Proposition 4.3].

Remark 1.5. Together with the classes $|\text{Ext}\mathcal{A}|$ and $|\text{Ext}\mathcal{B}|$ of extensions in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, the adjunction $(\mathbf{A})$ forms a Galois structure

$$\Gamma = (\mathcal{A} \xrightleftharpoons[\substack{\text{b} \\ \perp \\ \supset}]{\text{b}} \mathcal{B}, |\text{Ext}\mathcal{A}|, |\text{Ext}\mathcal{B}|)$$

in the sense of [25].

1.6. Pointed categories. In what follows it will be crucial that the terminal object 1 of $\mathcal{A}$ is also initial, i.e., that the category $\mathcal{A}$ is **pointed**. In this case, the object $1 = 0$ is called the **zero object** of $\mathcal{A}$. A map f is **zero** when it factors over the zero object.

Since the reflector $\mathbf{b}$ always preserves pullbacks of split epimorphisms along split epimorphisms, in the pointed case it also preserves products.

From now on, $\mathcal{A}$ will be a fixed pointed exact Goursat category; any Birkhoff subcategory $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is also pointed exact Goursat.

1.7. Perfect objects. An object A of $\mathcal{A}$ is called **perfect (with respect to $\mathcal{B}$)** or **$\mathbf{b}$ -perfect** when $\mathbf{b}A$ is the zero object 0 of $\mathcal{B}$. If $f: B \rightarrow A$ is an extension and B is perfect then so is A , because the reflector $\mathbf{b}$ preserves regular epimorphisms, and a regular quotient of zero is zero.

Lemma 1.8. *Let B' be a $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect object and let $f: B \rightarrow A$ be a $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension. If $b_0, b_1: B' \rightarrow B$ are morphisms such that $f \circ b_0 = f \circ b_1$ then $b_0 = b_1$.*

Proof. The extension f being central means that the square in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R[f] & \xrightarrow{f_0} & B & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ \eta_{R[f]} \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_B & & \\ \mathbf{b}R[f] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}f_0} & \mathbf{b}B & & \end{array}$$

is a pullback. Since $f \circ b_0 = f \circ b_1$, we have an induced map $(b_0, b_1): B' \rightarrow R[f]$. Now $f_0 \circ (b_0, b_1) = b_0 = f_0 \circ (b_0, b_1)$, but also

$$\eta_{R[f]} \circ (b_0, b_1) = \mathbf{b}(b_0, b_1) \circ \eta_{B'} = 0 = \mathbf{b}(b_0, b_1) \circ \eta_{B'} = \eta_{R[f]} \circ (b_0, b_1),$$

using that $\mathcal{A}$ is pointed. The uniqueness in the universal property of pullbacks now implies that $(b_0, b_0) = (b_0, b_1)$, so that $b_0 = b_1$. $\square$

Proposition 1.9. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a pointed Barr exact Goursat category and $\mathcal{B}$ a Birkhoff subcategory of $\mathcal{A}$. If $f: B \rightarrow A$ and $g: C \rightarrow B$ are $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions and C is a $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect object then the extension $f \circ g$ is $\mathbf{b}$ -central.*

Proof. Take the kernel pair of f and further pullbacks along g until the following left hand side commutative diagram is obtained, in which all the squares are pullbacks. Then apply the functor $\mathbf{b}$ to obtain the right hand side diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R[f \circ g] & \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} & R[f] & \xrightarrow{f_1} & C \\ \underline{g} \downarrow & \text{(i)} & \underline{g} \downarrow & \text{(iii)} & \downarrow g \\ R[f] & \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} & R[f] & \xrightarrow{f_1} & B \\ \bar{f}_0 \downarrow & \text{(ii)} & f_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ C & \xrightarrow{g} & B & \xrightarrow{f} & A \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{b}R[f \circ g] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}\bar{g}} & \mathbf{b}R[f] & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \mathbf{b}\underline{g} \downarrow & \text{(i')} & \mathbf{b}\underline{g} \downarrow & \text{(iii')} & \parallel \\ \mathbf{b}R[f] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}\bar{g}} & \mathbf{b}R[f] & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & \text{(ii')} & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & = & 0 & = & 0 \end{array}$$

The $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions f_0 and $\overline{f_0}$, f_1 and $\underline{f_1}$, being split epimorphisms, are $\mathbf{b}$ -trivial; since, moreover, (ii) is a pullback and $C \rightarrow 0$ is a regular epimorphism, Proposition 2.7 in [27] implies that the square (ii') is also a pullback. Similarly, (iii') is a pullback, too. This implies that $\mathbf{b}\overline{g}$ and $\mathbf{b}\underline{g}$ are isomorphisms. Again using that $\overline{f_0}$ is $\mathbf{b}$ -trivial, $\overline{R[f]}$ can be written as a product $\mathbf{b}\overline{R[f]} \times C$. Similarly, $R[f] = \mathbf{b}R[f] \times B$ and $\underline{R[f]} = \mathbf{b}\underline{R[f]} \times C$ so that the pullback square (i) becomes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P \times R[g] & \xrightarrow{p_1 \times g_1} & \mathbf{b}R[f] \times C \\ p_0 \times g_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{b}\underline{g} \times g \\ \mathbf{b}\overline{R[f]} \times C & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}\overline{g} \times g} & \mathbf{b}R[f] \times B, \end{array}$$

where (P, p_0, p_1) is the pullback induced by the square (i'). Note that p_0 and p_1 are isomorphisms. Now g_1 , and thus also $\overline{g}$, is a split epimorphism, so that $\overline{g}$ is a $\mathbf{b}$ -trivial extension as a pullback of the $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension g . It follows that the composite $\underline{f_1} \circ \overline{g} = (f \circ g)_1$ is $\mathbf{b}$ -trivial, which finishes the proof. $\square$

1.10. Universal central extensions. For an object A of $\mathcal{A}$, let $\text{Centr}_{\mathbf{b}}A$ denote the category of all $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions of A , i.e., the full subcategory of the slice category $\mathcal{A} \downarrow A$ determined by the central extensions. A (weakly) initial object of this category $\text{Centr}_{\mathbf{b}}A$ is called a **(weakly) universal central extension** of A . A central extension $u: U \rightarrow A$ is weakly universal when for every central extension $f: B \rightarrow A$ there exists a map $\overline{f}$ from u to f , i.e., such that $f \circ \overline{f} = u$. Also, u is universal when this induced map $\overline{f}$ is, moreover, unique. Note also that, up to isomorphism, an object admits at most one universal central extension.

Lemma 1.11. *If $u: U \rightarrow A$ is a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension then the objects U and A are $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect.*

Proof. Since the first projection $\text{pr}_A: A \times \mathbf{b}U \rightarrow A$ is a trivial extension, by Remark 1.4 it is a central extension. By assumption, there exists just one morphism $(u, v): U \rightarrow A \times \mathbf{b}U$ such that $\text{pr}_A \circ (u, v) = u$. But then $0: U \rightarrow \mathbf{b}U$ is equal to $\eta_U: U \rightarrow \mathbf{b}U$, and $\mathbf{b}U = 0$. Since a regular quotient of a perfect object is perfect, this implies that both U and A are $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect. $\square$

Proposition 1.12. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a pointed Barr exact Goursat category and $\mathcal{B}$ a Birkhoff subcategory of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $u: U \rightarrow A$ be a $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension. Between the following conditions, the implications (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) hold:*

- (1) U is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect and every central extension of U splits;
- (2) U is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect and projective with respect to all $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions;
- (3) U is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect and u is a weakly universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension;
- (4) u is a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension.

Proof. Suppose that (1) holds. To prove (2), let $f: B \rightarrow A$ be a $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension and $g: U \rightarrow A$ a morphism. Then the pullback $g^*f: \overline{B} \rightarrow U$ of f along g is still $\mathbf{b}$ -central; hence g^*f admits a splitting $s: U \rightarrow \overline{B}$, and $(f^*g) \circ s$ is the needed map $u \rightarrow f$. Conversely, given a $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension $f: B \rightarrow U$, the projectivity of U yields a map $s: U \rightarrow B$ such that $f \circ s = 1_U$.

Condition (2) implies condition (3): given a $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension $f: B \rightarrow A$ of A , by projectivity of U , there exists a morphism $\overline{f}: U \rightarrow B$ that satisfies $f \circ \overline{f} = u$.

Finally, (3) and (4) are equivalent by Lemma 1.8 and Lemma 1.11. $\square$

Remark 1.13. To prove that condition (3) implies (2) we need U itself to admit a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension, which need not be the case in the present context. But

if such a universal central extension of U does exist then the above four conditions are equivalent, as is shown in Corollary 2.14.

2. THE UNIVERSAL CENTRAL EXTENSION CONSTRUCTION

Our aim is now to prove that every perfect object admits a universal central extension. To do so, a richer categorical context is needed; for instance, a good notion of short exact sequence will be crucial in the construction of the centralisation of an extension and in the passage to a perfect subobject of an object. The existence of projective objects will also become important now: they will give us weakly universal central extensions. We switch to the framework of semi-abelian categories with enough projectives.

2.1. Semi-abelian categories. A pointed and regular category is **Bourn proto-modular** when the **(Regular) Short Five Lemma** holds: this means that for any commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} K[f'] & \xrightarrow{\text{Ker } f'} & B' & \xrightarrow{f'} & A' \\ k \downarrow & & \downarrow b & & \downarrow a \\ K[f] & \xrightarrow{\text{Ker } f} & B & \xrightarrow{f} & A \end{array} \quad (\text{C})$$

such that f and f' are regular epimorphisms, k and a being isomorphisms implies that b is an isomorphism. A **semi-abelian** category is pointed, Barr exact and Bourn protomodular with binary coproducts [28]. A variety of Ω -groups is always a semi-abelian category. A semi-abelian category is always Mal'tsev (hence it is also Goursat).

Since a regular epimorphism is always the cokernel of its kernel in a semi-abelian category, an appropriate notion of short exact sequence exists. A **short exact sequence** is any sequence

$$K \xrightarrow{k} B \xrightarrow{f} A$$

that satisfies $k = \text{Ker } f$ and $f = \text{Coker } k$. We denote this situation

$$0 \longrightarrow K \rightrightarrows B \rightrightarrows A \longrightarrow 0. \quad (\text{D})$$

Lemma 2.2. [5, 6] *Consider a morphism of short exact sequences as (C) above.*

- (1) *The right hand side square $f \circ b = a \circ f'$ is a pullback iff k is an iso.*
- (2) *The left hand side square $\text{Ker } f \circ k = b \circ \text{Ker } f'$ is a pullback iff a is a mono.*

The first statement implies that any pullback square between regular epimorphisms (i.e., any square as $f \circ b = a \circ f'$ in (C)) is a pushout. It is also well-known that the regular image of a kernel is a kernel [28]. In any semi-abelian category, the classical homological lemma's like the Snake Lemma and the 3×3 Lemma are valid; for further details and many other results we refer the reader to the article [28] and the monograph [4].

From now on, $\mathcal{A}$ will be a semi-abelian category and $\mathcal{B}$ a Birkhoff subcategory of $\mathcal{A}$.

2.3. Commutators and centralisation. The kernel μ of the unit η of the adjunction (A) gives rise to a “zero-dimensional” commutator as follows: for any object A of $\mathcal{A}$,

$$0 \longrightarrow [A, A]_{\mathcal{B}} \xrightarrow{\mu_A} A \xrightarrow{\eta_A} \mathbf{b}A \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence in $\mathcal{A}$; hence A is an object of $\mathcal{B}$ if and only if $[A, A]_{\mathbf{b}} = 0$. On the other hand, an object A of $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect precisely when $[A, A]_{\mathbf{b}} = A$. This construction defines a functor $[-, -]_{\mathbf{b}}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and a natural transformation $\mu: [-, -]_{\mathbf{b}} \Rightarrow 1_{\mathcal{A}}$. The functor $[-, -]_{\mathbf{b}}$ preserves regular epimorphisms; we recall the argument. Given a regular epimorphism $f: B \rightarrow A$, by the Birkhoff property, the induced square of regular epimorphisms $(\mathbf{B})$ is a pushout—but this is equivalent to the induced morphism $[f, f]_{\mathbf{b}}$ in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}} & \xrightarrow{\mu_B} & B & \xrightarrow{\eta_B} & \mathbf{b}B \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow [f, f]_{\mathbf{b}} & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow \mathbf{b}f \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & [A, A]_{\mathbf{b}} & \xrightarrow{\mu_A} & A & \xrightarrow{\eta_A} & \mathbf{b}A \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

being a regular epimorphism.

Lemma 2.2 implies that an extension f as in $(\mathbf{D})$ is $\mathbf{b}$ -central if and only if either one of the maps $[f_0, f_0]_{\mathbf{b}}, [f_1, f_1]_{\mathbf{b}}$ is an isomorphism, which happens exactly when they coincide, $[f_0, f_0]_{\mathbf{b}} = [f_1, f_1]_{\mathbf{b}}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & [K, B]_{\mathbf{b}} & & & & \\ & \swarrow \text{Ker } [f_0, f_0]_{\mathbf{b}} & \downarrow & \swarrow \mu_{R[f]} & \downarrow \eta_{R[f]} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & [R[f], R[f]]_{\mathbf{b}} & \xrightarrow{\mu_{R[f]}} & R[f] & \xrightarrow{\eta_{R[f]}} & \mathbf{b}R[f] \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow [f_0, f_0]_{\mathbf{b}} \quad \downarrow [f_1, f_1]_{\mathbf{b}} & & \downarrow f_0 \quad \downarrow f_1 & & \downarrow \mathbf{b}f_0 \quad \downarrow \mathbf{b}f_1 \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}} & \xrightarrow{\mu_B} & B & \xrightarrow{\eta_B} & \mathbf{b}B \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Hence the kernel $[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$ of $[f_0, f_0]_{\mathbf{b}}$ measures how far f is from being central: indeed, f is $\mathbf{b}$ -central if and only if $[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$ is zero.

Remark 2.4. This explains, for instance, why a sub-extension of a central extension is central. It is worth remarking here that a morphism of extensions (b_0, a_0) as in $(\mathbf{E})$ below is a monomorphism if and only if b_0 is.

The “one-dimensional” commutator $[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$ may be considered as a normal sub-object of B via the composite $\mu_B \circ [f_1, f_1]_{\mathbf{b}} \circ \text{Ker } [f_0, f_0]_{\mathbf{b}}: [K, B]_{\mathbf{b}} \rightarrow B$. Thus the Galois structure Γ from Remark 1.5 induces a new adjunction

$$\text{Ext } \mathcal{A} \xrightleftharpoons[\substack{\perp \\ \supset}]{\mathbf{b}_1} \text{CExt}_{\mathbf{b}} \mathcal{A},$$

where $\text{CExt}_{\mathbf{b}} \mathcal{A}$ is the full reflective subcategory of $\text{Ext } \mathcal{A}$ determined by the $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions. Given an extension $f: B \rightarrow A$ with kernel K , its **centralisation** $\mathbf{b}_1 f: B/[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}} \rightarrow A$ is obtained through the diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & [K, B]_{\mathbf{b}} & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & \frac{B}{[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow \mathbf{b}_1 f \\ & & 0 & \longrightarrow & A & \xlongequal{\quad} & A \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Considering this diagram as a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow K[\eta_f^1] \xrightarrow{\mu_f^1} f \xrightarrow{\eta_f^1} \mathbf{b}_1 f \longrightarrow 0$$

in the semi-abelian category of arrows $\text{Arr } \mathcal{A}$ (morphisms here are commutative squares) we obtain a description of the unit η^1 of the adjunction and its kernel μ^1 .

2.5. An “absolute” property of relative universal central extensions. This will not be used in what follows, but we find it worth remarking here that a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension is always central in an absolute sense, namely, with respect to the abelianisation functor $\mathbf{ab}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}\mathcal{A}$. Here $\mathbf{Ab}\mathcal{A}$ is the Birkhoff subcategory of $\mathcal{A}$ consisting of all objects that admit an internal abelian group structure; see, for instance, [7]. If $u: U \rightarrow A$ is a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension then $U \cong [U, U]_{\mathbf{b}}$ since U is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect and $[U, U]_{\mathbf{b}} \cong [R[u], R[u]]_{\mathbf{b}}$ since u is $\mathbf{b}$ -central. Hence the diagonal $U \rightarrow R[u]$, being isomorphic to $\mu_U: [R[u], R[u]]_{\mathbf{b}} \rightarrow R[u]$, is a kernel. By Proposition 3.1 in [7], this implies that u is $\mathbf{ab}$ -central.

2.6. Baer invariants. We recall the basic definitions of the theory of Baer invariants [17, Definition 3.1 and 3.3]. Two morphisms of extensions (b_0, a_0) and $(b_1, a_1): f' \rightarrow f$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B' & \xrightarrow[b_1]{b_0} & B \\ f' \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ A' & \xrightarrow[a_1]{a_0} & A \end{array} \quad (\mathbf{E})$$

are **homotopic** when $a_0 = a_1$. A **Baer invariant** is a functor $F: \mathbf{Ext}\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ which makes homotopic morphisms of extensions equal: if $(b_0, a_0) \simeq (b_1, a_1)$ then $F(b_0, a_0) = F(b_1, a_1)$. Such a functor sends homotopically equivalent extensions to isomorphic objects.

For instance, the functor $\mathbf{Ext}\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ that maps an extension

$$0 \longrightarrow K \rightrightarrows B \xrightarrow{f} A \longrightarrow 0 \quad (\mathbf{F})$$

to the quotient $[B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}/[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$ is an example of a Baer invariant, as is the functor which maps this extension to the quotient $(K \cap [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}})/[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$. See [17], and in particular its Proposition 4.6, for further details.

2.7. Existence of a weakly universal central extension. From now on we suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough (regular) projectives, i.e., given any object A of $\mathcal{A}$, there exists a regular epimorphism $f: B \rightarrow A$ with B projective, a **(projective) presentation** of A .

Lemma 2.8. *If the category $\mathcal{A}$ is semi-abelian with enough projectives then every object of $\mathcal{A}$ admits a weakly universal central extension.*

Proof. Given an object A of $\mathcal{A}$, the category $\mathbf{Centr}_{\mathbf{b}}A$ has a weakly initial object: given a projective presentation $f: B \rightarrow A$ with kernel K , its centralisation $\mathbf{b}_1 f: B/[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}} \rightarrow A$ is weakly initial. Indeed, any central extension $g: C \rightarrow A$ induces a morphism $\mathbf{b}_1 f \rightarrow g$ in $\mathbf{Centr}_{\mathbf{b}}A$, as the object B is projective. $\square$

2.9. The Schur multiplier. Let A be an object of $\mathcal{A}$ and $f: B \rightarrow A$ a projective presentation with kernel K . The induced objects

$$\frac{[B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}}{[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{K \cap [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}}{[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}}$$

are independent of the chosen projective presentation of A as explained above. Hence the following makes sense:

Definition 2.10. By analogy with classical homology theories, the latter object $K \cap [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}/[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$ is called the **second homology object** or the **Schur multiplier** of A (**relative to $\mathcal{B}$**) and is written $H_2(A, \mathbf{b})$. We write $U(A, \mathbf{b})$ for the object $[B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}/[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$, and $H_1(A, \mathbf{b})$ will denote the reflection $\mathbf{b}A$ of A into $\mathcal{B}$.

Remark 2.11. The objects $H_2(A, \mathbf{b})$ and $H_1(A, \mathbf{b})$ are genuine homology objects: if $\mathcal{A}$ is a semi-abelian monadic category then they may be computed using comonadic homology as in [18]; in any case, they fit into the homology theory worked out in [14]. Theorem 5.9 in [17] states that any short exact sequence $(\mathbf{D})$ induces a five-term exact sequence

$$H_2(B, \mathbf{b}) \longrightarrow H_2(A, \mathbf{b}) \longrightarrow \frac{K}{[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}} \longrightarrow H_1(B, \mathbf{b}) \longrightarrow H_1(A, \mathbf{b}) \longrightarrow 0.$$

This is a relative generalisation of the Stallings-Stammbach sequence for groups (which is recovered when $\mathbf{b}$ is the abelianisation functor from $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{Gp}$ to $\mathcal{B} = \mathbf{Ab}$), a categorical version of the analogous results considered in [19, 20, 34].

2.12. Existence of a universal central extension. The Baer invariants from 2.6 may now be considered for all weakly universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions of an object A : indeed, any two such extensions of A are always homotopically equivalent. Since for any weakly universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension $(\mathbf{F})$ the commutator $[K, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$ is zero, the objects

$$[B, B]_{\mathbf{b}} \quad \text{and} \quad K \cap [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$$

are independent of the chosen weakly universal central extension of A . (Here, as in [26], the Hopf formula becomes $H_2(A, \mathbf{b}) = K \cap [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$. Also note that $U(A, \mathbf{b}) = [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$.)

We are now ready to prove that, if A is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect, then a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension of A does exist. This is a relative version of Proposition 4.1 in [22].

Theorem 2.13. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a semi-abelian category with enough projectives and $\mathcal{B}$ a Birkhoff subcategory of $\mathcal{A}$. An object A of $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect if and only if it admits a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension. Moreover, this universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension may be chosen in such a way that it occurs in a short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow H_2(A, \mathbf{b}) \rightrightarrows U(A, \mathbf{b}) \xrightarrow{u_A^{\mathbf{b}}} A \longrightarrow 0.$$

Proof. If an object admits a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension then it is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect by Lemma 1.11. Conversely, let $(\mathbf{F})$ be a weakly universal central extension of a $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect object A . Since μ_A is an isomorphism and $[f, f]_{\mathbf{b}}$ is a regular epimorphism, the map $f \circ \mu_B = \mu_A \circ [f, f]_{\mathbf{b}}$ in the induced diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & K \cap [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}} & \rightrightarrows & [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}} & \xrightarrow{f \circ \mu_B} & A \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \mu_B & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K & \rightrightarrows & B & \xrightarrow{f} & A \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

is also a regular epimorphism. The extension $f \circ \mu_B$ is central as a subobject of the central extension f ; its weak universality is clear. By Proposition 1.12, it is also universal: indeed, the object $[B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}$ is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect, because the extensions $f \circ \mu_B$ and f are homotopically equivalent, so that $[B, B]_{\mathbf{b}} \cong [[B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}, [B, B]_{\mathbf{b}}]_{\mathbf{b}}$. $\square$

Corollary 2.14. *In Proposition 1.12, condition (3) implies condition (2). Hence a $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension $u: U \rightarrow A$ is universal if and only if its domain U is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect and projective with respect to all $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions.*

Proof. Suppose that $u: U \rightarrow A$ is a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension; we have to prove that every $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension of U splits. By Theorem 2.13, U admits a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension $v: V \rightarrow U$. It suffices to prove that this v is a split epimorphism. Now by Proposition 1.9, the composite $u \circ v: V \rightarrow A$ is a $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension. The weak universality of u now yields a map $s: U \rightarrow V$ such that $u \circ v \circ s = u$. But also

$u \circ 1_U = u$, so that $v \circ s = 1_U$ by the universality of u , and the universal central extension v splits. The result follows. $\square$

Corollary 2.15. *A $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension $u: U \rightarrow A$ is universal if and only if $H_1(U, \mathbf{b})$ and $H_2(U, \mathbf{b})$ are zero.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$ If $u: U \rightarrow A$ is a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension then by Corollary 2.14 we have $H_1(U, \mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{b}U = 0$ and U is projective with respect to all $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions. This implies that $1_U: U \rightarrow U$ is a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension of U . Theorem 2.13 now tells us that $H_2(U, \mathbf{b}) = 0$.

$\Leftarrow$ The object U is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect because $\mathbf{b}U = H_1(U, \mathbf{b}) = 0$; since $H_2(U, \mathbf{b})$ is also zero, the universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension $u_U^{\mathbf{b}}: U(U, \mathbf{b}) \rightarrow U$ of U induced by Theorem 2.13 is an isomorphism. Corollary 2.14 now implies that $U \cong U(U, \mathbf{b})$ is projective with respect to all $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions. Another application of Corollary 2.14 shows that u is also a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension. $\square$

Proposition 2.16. *Let $f: B \rightarrow A$ and $g: C \rightarrow B$ be $\mathbf{b}$ -central extensions. Then $f \circ g$ is a universal $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension if and only if g is.*

Proof. Under either one of the two assumptions the object C is $\mathbf{b}$ -perfect, so by Proposition 1.9 the composite $f \circ g$ is a $\mathbf{b}$ -central extension. The result now follows since $f \circ g$ and g have the same domain and by the previous results their universality only depends on a property of this domain. $\square$

3. NESTED BIRKHOFF SUBCATEGORIES

We now consider the situation where the Birkhoff subcategory $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ has a further Birkhoff subcategory $\mathcal{C}$ so that they form a chain of nested semi-abelian categories with enough projectives, $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$. Then there is a commutative triangle of left adjoint functors (all right adjoints are inclusions):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}} & \mathcal{B} \\ & \searrow \mathbf{cb} & \swarrow \mathbf{c} \\ & \mathcal{C} & \end{array}$$

Since the objects and morphisms of $\mathcal{B}$ are also objects and morphisms of $\mathcal{A}$, it is natural to compare the notions of $\mathbf{c}$ -centrality, $\mathbf{c}$ -perfect object, homology with respect to $\mathbf{c}$, etc. with that of $\mathbf{cb}$ -centrality, $\mathbf{cb}$ -perfect object or the homology with respect to $\mathbf{cb}$. We obtain a short exact sequence which relates the two induced types of universal central extension.

Lemma 3.1. *Under the given circumstances:*

- (1) *an object of $\mathcal{B}$ is $\mathbf{c}$ -perfect if and only if it is $\mathbf{cb}$ -perfect;*
- (2) *an extension in $\mathcal{B}$ is $\mathbf{c}$ -central if and only if it is $\mathbf{cb}$ -central.*

Proof. If B is an object of $\mathcal{B}$ then $\mathbf{c}B = \mathbf{cb}B$, which proves the first statement. As for the second statement, an extension $f: B \rightarrow A$ in $\mathcal{B}$ is $\mathbf{c}$ -central if and only if the square in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R[f] & \xrightarrow{f_0} & B & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ \eta_{R[f]}^{\mathbf{c}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_B^{\mathbf{c}} & & \\ \mathbf{c}R[f] & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{c}f_0} & \mathbf{c}B & & \end{array}$$

is a pullback. Now the inclusion of $\mathcal{B}$ into $\mathcal{A}$ preserves and reflects all limits and moreover $\mathbf{c}f_0 = \mathbf{c}bf_0$, so that f being $\mathbf{c}$ -central is equivalent to f being $\mathbf{cb}$ -central. $\square$

Lemma 3.2. *For any object B of $\mathcal{B}$, the adjunction $(\mathbf{A})$ restricts to an adjunction*

$$\mathrm{Centr}_{\mathbf{cb}} B \xrightleftharpoons[\sup]{\mathbf{b}} \mathrm{Centr}_{\mathbf{c}} B.$$

Hence the functor $\mathbf{b}$ preserves universal central extensions:

$$\mathbf{b}(u_B^{\mathbf{cb}}: U(B, \mathbf{cb}) \rightarrow B) \cong (u_B^{\mathbf{c}}: U(B, \mathbf{c}) \rightarrow B),$$

for any $\mathbf{c}$ -perfect object B .

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, $\mathrm{Centr}_{\mathbf{Ab}\mathcal{B}} B$ is a subcategory of $\mathrm{Centr}_{\mathbf{Ab}\mathcal{A}} B$.

Suppose that $g: C \rightarrow B$ is a $\mathbf{cb}$ -central extension. Applying the functor $\mathbf{b}$, we obtain the extension $\mathbf{b}g = g \circ \eta_C^{\mathbf{b}}: \mathbf{b}C \rightarrow B$, which is $\mathbf{cb}$ -central as a quotient of g . Being an extension in $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathbf{b}g$ is $\mathbf{c}$ -central by Lemma 3.1.

Finally, as any left adjoint functor, $\mathbf{b}$ preserves initial objects. $\square$

Proposition 3.3. *If B is a $\mathbf{c}$ -perfect object of $\mathcal{B}$ then we have the exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow H_2(U(B, \mathbf{c}), \mathbf{cb}) \triangleright \longrightarrow H_2(B, \mathbf{cb}) \longrightarrow H_2(B, \mathbf{c}) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Moreover,

$$[U(B, \mathbf{cb}), U(B, \mathbf{cb})]_{\mathbf{b}} = H_2(U(B, \mathbf{c}), \mathbf{cb}),$$

and $u_B^{\mathbf{cb}} = u_B^{\mathbf{c}}$ if and only if $H_2(B, \mathbf{cb}) \cong H_2(B, \mathbf{c})$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 2.13, when B is a $\mathbf{c}$ -perfect object of $\mathcal{B}$ then the comparison map between the induced universal central extensions gives rise to the following 3×3 diagram with short exact rows.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & H_2(U(B, \mathbf{c}), \mathbf{cb}) & \xlongequal{\quad} & H_2(U(B, \mathbf{c}), \mathbf{cb}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H_2(B, \mathbf{cb}) & \triangleright \longrightarrow & U(B, \mathbf{cb}) & \xrightarrow{u_B^{\mathbf{cb}}} & B \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H_2(B, \mathbf{c}) & \triangleright \longrightarrow & U(B, \mathbf{c}) & \xrightarrow{u_B^{\mathbf{c}}} & B \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

The middle column is also exact, by Theorem 2.13: indeed, in view of Remark 2.4, $\eta_{U(B, \mathbf{cb})}^{\mathbf{b}}$ is $\mathbf{cb}$ -central as a sub-extension of $u_B^{\mathbf{cb}}$; hence Proposition 2.16 implies that it is a universal $\mathbf{cb}$ -central extension of $U(B, \mathbf{c})$. The result now follows from the 3×3 Lemma. $\square$

4. EXAMPLES

In this final section of the text we illustrate the theory with some classical and contemporary examples. All categories we shall be considering here are (equivalent to) varieties of Ω -groups, and as such are semi-abelian with enough projectives. They are: the categories $\mathbf{Gp}$ of groups and $\mathbf{Ab}$ of abelian groups; $\mathbf{Leib}_{\mathbb{K}}$, $\mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{K}}$ of Leibniz algebras, Lie algebras and vector spaces over a field $\mathbb{K}$; and the categories $\mathbf{PMod}$, $\mathbf{XMod}$ and $\mathbf{AbXMod}$ of precrossed modules, crossed modules and abelian crossed modules.

4.1. Groups and abelian groups. The case of groups and abelian groups is well-known and entirely classical, but we think it is worth repeating. The left adjoint $\mathbf{ab}: \mathbf{Gp} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$ to the inclusion of $\mathbf{Ab}$ in $\mathbf{Gp}$ is called the **abelianisation functor**; it sends a group G to its abelianisation $G/[G, G]$. A surjective group homomorphism $f: B \rightarrow A$ is a central extension if and only if the commutator $[K[f], B]_{\mathbf{ab}} = [K[f], B]$ is trivial; given a group G and a normal subgroup N of G , their commutator $[N, G]$ is the normal subgroup of G generated by the elements $[n, g] = ngn^{-1}g^{-1}$ for all $n \in N$ and $g \in G$. Equivalently f is central if and only if the kernel $K[f]$ is contained in the centre

$$ZB = \{z \in B \mid [z, b] = 1 \text{ for all } b \in B\}$$

of B . A group G is perfect when G is equal to its commutator subgroup $[G, G]$. Computing the second integral homology group $H_2(G, \mathbb{Z}) = H_2(G, \mathbf{ab})$ of a perfect group G is particularly simple: take the universal central extension

$$u_G^{\mathbf{ab}}: U(G, \mathbf{ab}) \rightarrow G;$$

its kernel $K[u_G^{\mathbf{ab}}]$ is $H_2(G, \mathbb{Z})$.

4.2. Leibniz algebras, Lie algebras and vector spaces. Recall [31, 32] that a **Leibniz algebra** $\mathfrak{g}$ is a vector space over a field $\mathbb{K}$ equipped with a bilinear operation $[\cdot, \cdot]: \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ that satisfies

$$[x, [y, z]] = [[x, y], z] - [[x, z], y]$$

(the **Leibniz identity**) for all $x, y, z \in \mathfrak{g}$. When $[x, x] = 0$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ then the bracket is skew-symmetric and the Leibniz identity is the Jacobi identity, so $\mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie algebra.

Here there are three inclusions of Birkhoff subcategories, of which the left adjoints form the following commutative triangle.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Leib}_{\mathbb{K}} & \xrightarrow{(-)_{\mathbf{Lie}}} & \mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ & \searrow \text{vect} \circ (-)_{\mathbf{Lie}} & \swarrow \text{vect} \\ & \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{K}} & \end{array}$$

The left adjoint $(-)_{\mathbf{Lie}}: \mathbf{Leib}_{\mathbb{K}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}}$ (which is usually called the **Liesation functor**) takes a Leibniz algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and maps it to the quotient $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbf{Ann}}$, where $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbf{Ann}}$ is the two-sided ideal (i.e., normal subalgebra) of $\mathfrak{g}$ generated by all elements $[x, x]$ for $x \in \mathfrak{g}$. The category $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{K}}$ may be considered as a subvariety of $\mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}}$ by equipping a vector space with the trivial Lie bracket; the left adjoint $\text{vect}: \mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{K}}$ to the inclusion $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{K}} \subset \mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}}$ takes a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and maps it to the quotient $\mathfrak{g}/[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$, where $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ is generated by the elements $[x, y] \in \mathfrak{g}$ for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{g}$.

The notion of central extension obtained in the case of $\mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}}$ vs. $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is the ordinary notion of central extension of Lie algebras, where the kernel $K[f]$ of $f: \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$

should be included in the centre of $\mathfrak{b}$, i.e., in

$$Z\mathfrak{b} = \{z \in \mathfrak{b} \mid [z, b] = 0 \text{ for all } b \in \mathfrak{b}\}.$$

Examples of universal $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{K}}$ -central extensions of Leibniz algebras over a field $\mathbb{K}$ may be found in [11]; in this case, the notion of perfect object is the classical one.

On the other hand, a Leibniz algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is perfect with respect to $\mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}}$ if and only if $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^{\text{Ann}}$. Moreover, given a Leibniz algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, we may consider the two-sided ideal generated by

$$\{z \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [g, z] = -[z, g] \text{ for all } g \in \mathfrak{g}\};$$

we call it the $\mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}}$ -**centre** of $\mathfrak{g}$ and denote it by $Z_{\mathbf{Lie}}(\mathfrak{g})$. When $\mathbb{K}$ is a field of characteristic different from 2 then this relative centre allows us to characterise the $(-)\mathbf{Lie}$ -central extensions of Leibniz algebras over $\mathbb{K}$.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose $\mathbb{K}$ is a field of characteristic different from 2. For an extension $f: \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ of Leibniz algebras over $\mathbb{K}$, the following three conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $f: \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ is central with respect to $\mathbf{Lie}_{\mathbb{K}}$;
- (2) $R[f]^{\text{Ann}} \cong \mathfrak{b}^{\text{Ann}}$;
- (3) $K[f] \subset Z_{\mathbf{Lie}}(\mathfrak{b})$.

Proof. Condition (1) is equivalent to (2) by definition. Now suppose that (2) holds and consider $k \in K[f]$ and $b \in \mathfrak{b}$. Then both $[(k, 0), (k, 0)] = ([k, k], [0, 0])$ and $[(b - k, b), (b - k, b)] = ([b - k, b - k], [b, b])$ are in $R[f]^{\text{Ann}}$, which implies that $[k, k] = [0, 0] = 0$ and $[b - k, b - k] = [b, b]$. Thus we see that $[b, k] + [k, b] = 0$, which implies that condition (3) holds.

Conversely, consider $[(b - k, b), (b - k, b)]$ in $R[f]^{\text{Ann}} \cap K[f_1]$, where f_1 denotes the second projection of the kernel pair of f . Then k is an element of the kernel of f and

$$0 = f_1[(b - k, b), (b - k, b)] = f_1([b - k, b - k], [b, b]) = [b, b].$$

Now (3) implies that $[k, k] + [k, k] = 0$, so that $[k, k] = 0$, since $\text{char}(\mathbb{K}) \neq 2$. Furthermore, $[b, k] + [k, b] = 0$, which implies that

$$[b - k, b - k] = [b, b] - [b, k] - [k, b] + [k, k] = 0.$$

Hence $R[f]^{\text{Ann}} \cap K[f_1]$ is zero, so that $R[f]^{\text{Ann}} \cong \mathfrak{b}^{\text{Ann}}$ and condition (2) holds. $\square$

Given a Leibniz algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, the homology vector space $H_2(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{vect}^\circ(-)_{\mathbf{Lie}})$ is the Leibniz homology developed in [33]; see also [12, 35]. As far as we know, the homology Lie algebra $H_2(\mathfrak{g}, (-)_{\mathbf{Lie}})$ has not been studied before, but certainly the theories referred to in Remark 2.11 apply to it. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie algebra then the vector space $H_2(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{vect})$ is the classical Chevalley-Eilenberg homology. If we interpret Proposition 3.3 in the present situation then we recover Corollary 2.7 from [21], but in the special case where $\mathbb{K}$ is a field:

Proposition 4.4. *If $\mathfrak{g}$ is a perfect Lie algebra then $H_2(U(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{vect}), \mathbf{vect}^\circ(-)_{\mathbf{Lie}})$ is the kernel of $H_2(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{vect}^\circ(-)_{\mathbf{Lie}}) \rightarrow H_2(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{vect})$. Moreover,*

$$[U(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{vect}^\circ(-)_{\mathbf{Lie}}), U(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{vect}^\circ(-)_{\mathbf{Lie}})]_{(-)_{\mathbf{Lie}}} = H_2(U(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{vect}), \mathbf{vect}^\circ(-)_{\mathbf{Lie}}).$$

4.5. Precrossed modules, crossed modules and abelian crossed modules.

Recall that a **precrossed module** (T, G, ∂) is a group homomorphism $\partial: T \rightarrow G$ together with an action of G on T , denoted ${}^g t$ for $g \in G$ and $t \in T$, satisfying $\partial({}^g t) = g\partial(t)g^{-1}$ for all $g \in G$ and $t \in T$. If in addition it verifies the **Pfeiffer identity** $\partial({}^t t') = t't^{-1}$ for all $t, t' \in T$ then we say that (T, G, ∂) is a **crossed module**. A morphism of (pre)crossed modules $(f_1, f_0): (T, G, \partial) \rightarrow (T', G', \partial')$ consists of group homomorphisms $f_1: T \rightarrow T'$ and $f_0: G \rightarrow G'$ such that $\partial' \circ f_1 = f_0 \circ \partial$ and the action is preserved. The categories $\mathbf{PXMod}$ and $\mathbf{XMod}$ are equivalent to varieties

of Ω -groups; see, e.g., [28], [29] or [30]. The category **AbXMod** consists of **abelian** crossed modules, i.e., (T, G, ∂) such that T and G are abelian groups and the action of G on T is trivial.

As in the previous example, we obtain a commutative triangle of left adjoint functors.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{PXMod} & \xrightarrow{(-)_{\text{Peiff}}} & \mathbf{XMod} \\ & \searrow \text{abo}(-)_{\text{Peiff}} \quad \swarrow \text{ab} & \\ & \mathbf{AbXMod} & \end{array}$$

Given two normal precrossed submodules (M, H, ∂) and (N, K, ∂) of a precrossed module (T, G, ∂) , the **Peiffer commutator** $\langle M, N \rangle$ is the normal subgroup of T generated by the Peiffer elements $\langle m, n \rangle = mn m^{-1} (\partial(m)n)^{-1}$ and $\langle n, m \rangle = nm n^{-1} (\partial(n)m)^{-1}$ for $m \in M$, $n \in N$ [13]. We denote by

$$\langle (M, H, \partial), (N, K, \partial) \rangle$$

the precrossed module $(\langle M, N \rangle, 1, 1)$; it may be considered as a normal precrossed submodule of (T, G, ∂) . The precrossed module

$$\langle (T, G, \partial), (T, G, \partial) \rangle = (\langle T, T \rangle, 1, 1)$$

is the smallest one that makes the quotient $(T, G, \partial) / \langle (T, G, \partial), (T, G, \partial) \rangle$ a crossed module. This defines a functor $(-)_{\text{Peiff}} : \mathbf{PXMod} \rightarrow \mathbf{XMod}$, left adjoint to the inclusion of $\mathbf{XMod}$ in $\mathbf{PXMod}$.

A precrossed module (T, G, ∂) is $(-)_{\text{Peiff}}$ -perfect when

$$(T, G, \partial) = \langle (T, G, \partial), (T, G, \partial) \rangle.$$

In particular, then $G = 1$; hence $\langle T, T \rangle = [T, T]$, so that (T, G, ∂) is perfect with respect to $\mathbf{XMod}$ exactly when T is perfect with respect to **Ab** and G is trivial.

The results of [16, Section 9.5] imply that an extension of precrossed modules $f : B \rightarrow A$ is central with respect to $\mathbf{XMod}$ if and only if $\langle K[f], B \rangle = 1$; the following characterisation may also be shown analogously to Proposition 4.3. Given a precrossed module (T, G, ∂) , its **XMod-centre** $Z_{\mathbf{XMod}}(T, G, \partial)$ is the normal precrossed submodule $(Z_{\mathbf{XMod}}T, G, \partial)$ of (T, G, ∂) where

$$Z_{\mathbf{XMod}}T = \{t \in T \mid \langle t, t' \rangle = 1 = \langle t', t \rangle \text{ for all } t' \in T\}.$$

Proposition 4.6. *For an extension $(f_1, f_0) : (T, G, \partial) \rightarrow (T', G', \partial')$ of precrossed modules, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) (f_1, f_0) is central with respect to $\mathbf{XMod}$;
- (2) $\langle (R[f_1], R[f_0], \partial \times \partial), (R[f_1], R[f_0], \partial \times \partial) \rangle \cong \langle (T, G, \partial), (T, G, \partial) \rangle$;
- (3) $\langle R[f_1], R[f_1] \rangle \cong \langle T, T \rangle$;
- (4) $K[f_1] \subset Z_{\mathbf{XMod}}T$;
- (5) $K[(f_1, f_0)] \subset Z_{\mathbf{XMod}}(T, G, \partial)$.

Alternatively, these central extensions may be characterised in terms of group commutators: see [15].

We now focus on the further adjunction to **AbXMod**. Given a precrossed module (T, G, ∂) , the commutator $[G, T]$ is the normal subgroup of T generated by the elements $g t g^{-1} t^{-1}$ for $g \in G$ and $t \in T$. The left adjoint $\text{ab} : \mathbf{XMod} \rightarrow \mathbf{AbXMod}$ takes a crossed module (T, G, ∂) and maps it to $\text{ab}(T, G, \partial) = (T/[G, T], G/[G, G], \bar{\partial})$, where $\bar{\partial}$ is the induced group homomorphism. The functor

$$\text{ab} \circ (-)_{\text{Peiff}} : \mathbf{PXMod} \rightarrow \mathbf{AbXMod}$$

maps a precrossed module (T, G, ∂) to $(T/[T, T][G, T], G/[G, G], \bar{\partial})$.

As shown in [7], an extension of crossed modules is central with respect to $\mathbf{AbXMod}$ exactly when it is central in the sense of [23]. An extension of *precrossed* modules is central with respect to $\mathbf{AbXMod}$ if and only if it is central in the sense of [1, 2]. In this case, the notions of perfect object obtained are classical. The article [1] gives several non-trivial examples of universal central extensions of (pre)crossed modules, relative to $\mathbf{AbXMod}$.

The homology crossed module $H_2((T, G, \partial), \mathbf{ab} \circ (-)_{\text{Peiff}})$ was studied in [3]; on the other hand, $H_2((T, G, \partial), \mathbf{ab})$ was considered in [9]. For a precrossed module (T, G, ∂) , the relative $H_2((T, G, \partial), (-)_{\text{Peiff}})$ was characterised in [16]. If we interpret Proposition 3.3 in this situation then we regain [1, Theorem 5].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Tomas Everaert and Julia Goedecke for some invaluable suggestions. Thanks also to the University of Coimbra and the University of Vigo for their kind hospitality.

The first author's research was supported by Ministerio de Educacion y Ciencia under grant number MTM2009-14464-C02-02 (includes European FEDER support), by Xunta de Galicia under grant number PGIDIT06PXIB371128PR and by project Ingenio Mathematica (i-MATH) under grant number CSD2006-00032 (Consolider Ingenio 2010). The second author's research was supported by CMUC and FCT.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Arias, J. M. Casas, and M. Ladra, On universal central extensions of precrossed and crossed modules, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **210** (2007), 177–191.
- [2] D. Arias and M. Ladra, Central extensions of precrossed modules, *Appl. Categ. Struct.* **12** (2004), no. 4, 339–354.
- [3] D. Arias, M. Ladra, and A. R. Grandjeán, Homology of precrossed modules, *Illinois J. Math* **46** (2002), no. 3, 739–754.
- [4] F. Borceux and D. Bourn, Mal'cev, protomodular, homological and semi-abelian categories, *Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 566, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004.
- [5] D. Bourn, Normalization equivalence, kernel equivalence and affine categories, *Category Theory, Proceedings Como 1990* (A. Carboni, M. C. Pedicchio and G. Rosolini, eds.), *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 1488, Springer, 1991, pp. 43–62.
- [6] ———, 3×3 lemma and protomodularity, *J. Algebra* **236** (2001), 778–795.
- [7] D. Bourn and M. Gran, Central extensions in semi-abelian categories, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **175** (2002), 31–44.
- [8] A. Carboni, G. M. Kelly, and M. C. Pedicchio, Some remarks on Maltsev and Goursat categories, *Appl. Categ. Struct.* **1** (1993), 385–421.
- [9] P. Carrasco, A. M. Cegarra, and A. R. Grandjeán, (Co)Homology of crossed modules, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **168** (2002), no. 2-3, 147–176.
- [10] J. M. Casas and N. Corral, On universal central extensions of Leibniz algebras, *Comm. Alg.* **37** (2009), no. 6, 2104–2120.
- [11] J. M. Casas and M. Ladra, Computing low dimensional Leibniz homology of some perfect Leibniz algebras, *Southeast Asian Bull. Math.* **31** (2007), 683–690.
- [12] J. M. Casas and T. Pirashvili, Ten-term exact sequence of Leibniz homology, *J. Algebra* **231** (2000), 258–264.
- [13] G. Ellis, On Peiffer central series, *Glasgow Math. J.* **40** (1998), 177–185.
- [14] T. Everaert, Higher central extensions and Hopf formulae, to appear in *J. Algebra*, doi:10.1016/j.jalgebra.2008.12.015, 2008.
- [15] T. Everaert and M. Gran, Central extensions of internal reflexive graphs, preprint, 2009.
- [16] T. Everaert, M. Gran, and T. Van der Linden, Higher Hopf formulae for homology via Galois Theory, *Adv. Math.* **217** (2008), 2231–2267.
- [17] T. Everaert and T. Van der Linden, Baer invariants in semi-abelian categories I: General theory, *Theory Appl. Categ.* **12** (2004), no. 1, 1–33.
- [18] ———, Baer invariants in semi-abelian categories II: Homology, *Theory Appl. Categ.* **12** (2004), no. 4, 195–224.
- [19] A. Fröhlich, Baer-invariants of algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **109** (1963), 221–244.

- [20] J. Furtado-Coelho, Homology and generalized Baer invariants, *J. Algebra* **40** (1976), 596–609.
- [21] A. V. Gnedbaye, Third homology groups of universal central extensions of a Lie algebra, *Afrika Math. (Série 3)* **10** (1999), 46–63.
- [22] M. Gran and T. Van der Linden, On the second cohomology group in semi-abelian categories, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **212** (2008), 636–651.
- [23] A. R. Grandjeán and M. Ladra, $H_2(T, G, \partial)$ and central extensions for crossed modules, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* **42** (1999), 169–177.
- [24] P. J. Higgins, Groups with multiple operators, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **6** (1956), 366–416.
- [25] G. Janelidze, Pure Galois theory in categories, *J. Algebra* **132** (1990), 270–286.
- [26] ———, Galois groups, abstract commutators and Hopf formula, *Appl. Categ. Struct.* **16** (2008), 653–668.
- [27] G. Janelidze and G. M. Kelly, Galois theory and a general notion of central extension, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **97** (1994), 135–161.
- [28] G. Janelidze, L. Márki, and W. Tholen, Semi-abelian categories, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **168** (2002), 367–386.
- [29] R. Lavendhomme and J. R. Roisin, Cohomologie non abélienne de structures algébriques, *J. Algebra* **67** (1980), 385–414.
- [30] J.-L. Loday, Spaces with finitely many non-trivial homotopy groups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **24** (1982), 179–202.
- [31] ———, Une version non commutative des algèbres de Lie: les algèbres de Leibniz, *Enseign. Math.* **39** (1993), 269–292.
- [32] ———, Cyclic homology, 2nd ed., *Grundle. math. Wiss.*, vol. 301, Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [33] J.-L. Loday and T. Pirashvili, Universal enveloping algebras of Leibniz algebras and (co)homology, *Math. Ann* **296** (1993), 139–158.
- [34] A. S.-T. Lue, Baer-invariants and extensions relative to a variety, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **63** (1967), 569–578.
- [35] T. Pirashvili, On Leibniz homology, *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble* **44** (1994), no. 2, 401–411.

DPTO. DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA I, UNIVERSIDAD DE VIGO, E.U.I.T. FORESTAL, CAMPUS UNIVERSITARIO A XUNQUIERA, 36005 PONTEVEDRA, SPAIN

E-mail address: `jmcasas@uvigo.es`

CENTRO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA, 3001-454 COIMBRA, PORTUGAL

E-mail address: `tvdlinde@vub.ac.be`